9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

600

AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST

Organ of the American Anthropological Association, the Central States Branch of the American Anthropological Association, the American Ethnological Society, the Anthropological Society of Hawaii, the Anthropological Society of Washington, and the Philadelphia Anthropological Society

J. ALDEN MASON, *Editor*
A. IRVING HALLOWELL, *Book Review Editor*
FREDERICA DE LAGUNA, AND J. LAWRENCE ANGEL, *Associate Editors*

VOLUME 50

PRINTED IN
MENASHA, WISCONSIN, U. S. A.

PUBLISHED BY
THE AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
1948

[title page]

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

COMANCHE KIN BEHAVIOR[1]

By THOMAS GLADWIN

121 ANY system of kinship consists of a number of more or less rigid, culturally determined patterns of attitude and behavior toward certain categories of individuals in one's community or tribe; these patterns are symbolized on a verbal level. Each of these individuals is tagged with a term of relationship which determines, to some extent at least, how one should feel and act toward this person. These terms form but a part of the fairly large terminology of status with which a member of a group is equipped for his guidance in dealing with his fellows; but they fall into readily apprehended and well-integrated systems, found in various forms among all peoples, and have thus received what is perhaps an undue share of attention.

However, in spite of the fact that the relationships thus classified function primarily as symbols for patterns of behavior and attitude, the bulk of work with kinship has failed to consider the association between these symbols and their behavioral and affective concomitants. While comparative-historical reconstructions and the various sorts of analytical studies, all on a largely formal level, are unquestionably of value, it must be remembered that they present only a very partial picture; any assumptions concerning the association, except in the most general terms, of any behavior patterns with kinship terms are not justified until demonstrated.

Attempts to provide more complete studies of kinship systems have not been numerous in the North American field, though there is an increasing tendency in this direction. Some time ago, Radcliffe-Brown suggested an outline for a study of this sort:

> Kinship systems vary in different forms of social organization all over the world in respect of three characters; (1) the extent to which genealogical relationships are recognized for social purposes, (2) the way in which relatives are classified and grouped, (3) the particular customs by which the behavior of relatives, as so recognized, classified and grouped, is regulated in their dealings with each other.[2]

While one may not agree with Radcliffe-Brown in all his theoretical premises and goals,[3] this none the less provides an excellent basis for description, es-

[1] The material upon which this study is based was obtained during the field work of a group under the direction of Dr. George Herzog, sponsored by Columbia University, during the summer of 1940. The guidance and suggestions of Dr. Herzog both in the field and during the subsequent analysis of the data have been of very considerable assistance, and I take this opportunity to express my sincerest thanks to him. I am also indebted to the other members of the group for access to the material they collected relevant to my problem; it is to be hoped that the picture will soon be rounded out by the publication of their portions of the study.

[2] Radcliffe-Brown (1930), p. 43.

[3] *See* Steward (1938 b). This approach was also the subject of considerable altercation between Kroeber (1934), Radcliffe-Brown (1935), and Opler (1937). This discussion was primarily con-

[pp 1-72 not processed]

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

121 pecially if one accepts the implication of the necessity for comparative background contained in the first part of the quotation. This scheme is basic to a number of North American studies contained in the *Social Anthropology of North American Tribes*, edited by Fred Eggan,[4] and will be followed here, though without strict adherence in detail to the method of the Eggan volume.

THE KINSHIP TERMINOLOGY

601 The list of terms which identify relatives among the Comanche are given in a separate table, the first being descriptive, and those in parentheses the forms used in direct address. With them are included the English equivalents for the closer relationships; these will be used hereafter for the sake of clarity whenever possible.[5]

COMANCHE KINSHIP TERMS AND THEIR ENGLISH EQUIVALENTS

có·ʔ (có·ʔ)	g.g.p.; g.g.cil.
kĭ' nuʔ (kĭ'nhʊ)	f.f., f.f.b., f.m.b., f.f.si.h., f.m.si.h.; *m.s.*: s.cil., b.s.cil., si.s.cil., w.b.s.cil., w.si.s.cil.
hu''ciʔ (hu'cɪ)	f.m., f.m.si., f.f.si., f.m.b.w., f.f.b.w.; *w.s.*: s.cil., si.s.cil., b.s.cil., h.si.s.cil., h.b.s.cil.
to'koʔ (to'ko)	m.f., m.f.b., m.m.b., m.m.si.h., m.f.si.h.; *m.s.*: d.cil., b.d.cil., si.d.cil., w.si.d.cil., w.b.d.cil.
ka'kuʔ (ka'kʊ)	m.m., m.m.si., m.f.si., m.m.b.w., m.f.b.w.; *w.s.*: d.cil., si.d.cil., b.d.cil., h.si.d.cil., h.b.d.cil.
ʔa''pĭʔ (ʔa''p(ĭ))	f., f.b., m.si.h., m.si.h.b.
pi'aʔ (pi'a)	m., m.si., f.b.w., f.b.w.si.
ʔa'raʔ (ʔa'rhA)	m.b., f.si.h.; *m.s.*: si.cil., w.b.cil.
pa'haʔ (páhA)	f.si., m.b.w.; *w.s.*: b.cil., h.si.cil.
pa'viʔ (pávɪ)	o.b., *if older than speaker:* f.si.s., f.b.s., m.b.s., m.si.s.; *w.s.*: h.si.h.
ta'miʔ (ta'mɪ)	y.b., *if younger than speaker:* f.si.s., f.b.s., m.b.s., m.si.s.; *w.s.*: h.si.h.
pa'ciʔ (pa'cɪ)	o.si., *if older than speaker:* f.b.d., f.si.d., m.b.d., m.si.d.; *m.s.*: w.b.w.
na'miʔ (na'mɪ)	y.si.. *if younger than speaker:* f.b.d., f.si.d., m.b.d., m.si.d.; *m.s.*: w.b.w.

cerned with the historical and structural aspects of the problem, that is, whether similar kinship systems always implied similar social structure in comparable cultures and vice versa. As no one denies the association of *some* specific behavior with the use of kinship terms within any society, it does not appear necessary to take a position here relative to this question.

[4] Eggan (1937).

[5] Hoebel has already presented such a table. However, he does not distinguish between the descriptive and the address forms, nor does he include all the terms here listed. Therefore it seems advisable to present the complete system again. *See* Hoebel (1939), pp. 441–442.

Most abbreviations used should be obvious. A few may be amplified: cil (children), *m.s.* (man speaking), *w.s.* (woman speaking).

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

601

sa'mu'pi? (sa'mup)	*m.s.*: si.; *w.s.*: b.; also cousins of opp. sex.
ta'ka? (no address form)	b., si.: also cousins.
tu'a? (tua')	s.; *m.s.*: b.s., w.si.s.; *w.s.*: si.s., h.b.s.
pe'tI? (pe't(I))	d.; *m.s.*: b.d., w.si.d.; *w.s.*: si.d., h.b.d.
mo'na'pi? (mo'napI)	d.h., si.d.h., b.d.h.
hu''cipia'pi? (hu''cipia')	s.w., b.s.w., si.s.w.
cò·?a?a''pi? (cò·?a?a'p(I))	g.d.h.
cò·?api'a? (cò·?api'a')	g.s.w.
nImIco'·? (nImIco'·?)	*m.s.*: w.g.p.; *w.s.*: h.g.p.
nImIto'ko? (nImIto'ko)	*m.s.*: w.f., w.f.b., w.f.si.h., w.m.b., w.m.si.h.
nImIka'ku? (nImIka'ku)	*m.s.*: w.m., w.m.si., w.f.si., w.m.b.w., w.f.b.w.
ya'hi'pi? (ya'hip)	*w.s.*: h.f., h.f.b., h.m.b., h.f.si.h., h.m.si.h.; h.m., h.m.si., h.f.si., h.m.b.w., h.f.b.w.
ku·'ma'pi? (kú'map(I))	*w.s.*: h., h.b., si.h., si.h.b.
kwI'·p (kwI'h(I))	*m.s.*: w., w.si., b.w., b.w.si.
te'?cI (te'?cI)	*m.s.*: w.b., si.h.
pa'hapia'pi? (pa'hapia'pI?)	*w.s.*: h.si., b.w.
ha'ipia (ha'ipia)	*m.s.*: w.si., b.w., b.w.si.; *w.s.*: h.b., si.h., si.h.b.
ha'ic (ha'ic)	*m.s.*: male friend; w.si.h.(?); f.b.s., f.si.s., m.b.s., m.si.s.
tI'·i? (tI'·i)	*w.s.*: female friend; h.b.w.(?); f.b.d., f.si.d., m.b.d., m.si.d.

It is important to recognize that, with one somewhat confused exception (háic), these relationship terms each apply to a group of individuals of indefinite number, limited only by the fact that they normally belong only to one generation (of relationship, not age), and of course that they all stand in a certain relation to the speaker. While this group may have no functional significance as such, and certainly its limits are very poorly defined in any given case, this is the manner in which the kinship system operates at the verbal level. Behaviorally, there is no doubt that a certain focal individual (or individuals) is clearly recognized, and the rest of the group is more or less characterized, at least potentially, by this focal relationship; but to describe these groups exclusively in terms of such a person or persons is to give an erroneous picture of the actual structure of the system.

COMPARATIVE

601
171

In seeking for comparisons with Comanche kinship customs, one finds that these corroborate the already known origin of the Comanche as an offshoot of the Wyoming Shoshoni. Comparing them with the nearby Fort Hall and Lemhi Shoshoni relationship terminologies as given by Steward[9] one finds such extreme similarity, both phonetically and conceptually, that a very close historical connection between the two is indisputable. The only real difference is a negative one: the Comanche have no terms for a child's spouse's parents, and thus

[9] Steward (1938 a), pp. 297–306.

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

601 171 do not consider them relatives. The other difference of any importance is the substitution of a single unanalyzable term for the husband's parents noted above; the Lemhi Shoshoni have all four of the "our (children's) grandparent" terms possible, and the Fort Hall Shoshani three, according to Steward.

From this general Fort Hall area in southeastern Idaho, among the various Basin groups, similarities with the Comanche relationship terminology gradually decrease to the south and southwest, as might be expected.

Wider comparisons with Uto-Aztecan and other kinship systems may be found in a recent article of Shimkin's,[7] for such close similarities with the Basin groups permit his conclusions concerning the Shoshoni to be applied to the Comanche without modification.

APPLICATION OF THE TERMINOLOGY

601 While the structure of the Comanche kinship terminology is such that the number of people covered by it is theoretically infinite, it is obvious that there must be some limit to the size of the groups involved.

In the ascending generations, a limit is set by the terms at the third. Actually, the possibility that anyone old enough to use these words would have a great-grandparent living was fairly small, specially in the pre-settlement days. Furthermore, the Comanche had a tabu on mentioning the name of any relative or close friend who was dead, so that discussion of the family tree was never a pastime, and, in most cases, little children never knew or soon forgot who their great-grandparents were.

Beyond the third descending generation, one "runs out of relatives" also, and may select any terms one wishes to describe great-great-grandchildren and others of this generation. There is thus considerable variation to be found in these distant relationships. One informant started over with younger sibling terms, while another just repeated the designation of "great-grandchild." Naturally, these relationships are only a little more common than those with great-grandparents; they nearly always involve very old people and little children, and are usually not in a direct line of descent, permitting some discrepancy between age and generation.

Thus while there are occasional exceptions, the kinship terminology normally operates over a span of six generations, two above and three below that of the speaker.

Horizontally, however, there is no such limitation either of terminology or, directly at least, of mortality. No other mechanism is consciously recognized, nor is any apparent in a systematic examination of genealogical material. However, as a rough rule of thumb, it may be said that, with surprisingly few exceptions, the line of kinship ceases to be traced when it has passed through two marriage relationships between the speaker and the person under con-

[7] Shimkin (1941).

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

sideration, with no other blood ties to bridge the gap. The existence of the "unrelated" spouses involved in these second marriages as parts of the group of relations under consideration is recognized, and a number of relatives of theirs may even be given under questioning, but some different line of relationship, usually stemming from a purported "blood" tie, is selected by which to identify them. The completeness of this other identification is well illustrated by the fact that frequently, when an informant was asked what the correct term for one of these individuals would be through the line which had been under consideration, the answer could be shown by later checking to be incorrect.

Exceptions to this rule are, of course, relatively frequent, the most common cause being variations in residence. Thus the man from whom I collected a complete genealogy[8] spent the whole of the course of his fairly long second marriage with his wife's family, and thus became accustomed to using the proper terms for a great many of them, in spite of the fact that several were connected by lines involving two marriages beside his own. Another remarkably frequent situation was one in which another line of descent coincides with the one in question, and, reinforcing this last, causes the group to be considerably extended in size. There was no awareness of whether a given relationship should be traced back through one or the other line.

Personality factors are unquestionably also operative in governing the size of the kin-group; not only will relationship be more readily admitted or sought after with people one likes or who are high in prestige, and vice versa, but we also had a feeling that some people were much more anxious than others to surround themselves with as many relatives as possible and to be able to implement these relationships by knowing how to trace them, thus supporting the implication of admittance to the in-group of the addressee, and the mutual support and esteem there expected. This opinion was corroborated by some of the younger men, but we were not able to get any more direct evidence than this. Naturally, our knowledge of the personalities of the informants was comparatively sketchy as a result of our short contact with them. Dr. Clyde Kluckhohn has indicated that his extensive work with the Navaho has shown clearly that such a desire exists among certain individuals there, leading to an effort to expand the group of known kin as far as possible.

---

[8] Two complete genealogies were collected, one from a man (T), and the other from a woman (TY). T had been blind for the last twenty-eight years of his life, so that he did not always know some of the younger people. Other informants contributed more fragmentary genealogical information, limited both by time and their lack of interest in the subject, while all informants produced isolated examples and generalizations in response to questions. The two complete genealogies comprised 187 and 133 individuals respectively.

It should be noted that the phrase "line of relationship" refers to no functional kingroup, but only to those individuals through whom relationship is traced.

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

601 Thus we see that in spite of these and other exceptional situations the size of the group of relatives which may be established through any given line of relationships is fairly definitely limited. Actually, however, it is quite clear that a Comanche could almost always call every other Comanche by a relationship term of some sort or other, and usually did. Of course, with a system which is completely repetitive, such as this one, it is only necessary to establish relationships with one person in the group, find out in which direction the term goes if it is reciprocal, and all the rest of the relatives will fall into place. This must have been of great assistance in the old days to someone changing band allegiance. At the present time there is seldom any real difficulty in locating a common relative with anyone in the tribe. The actual origin of most of these relationships is naturally lost; usually they will be phrased as "no real relation" or, at best, an "old relation."

But one may speculate that many of them are actual old lines, whose common origins have been lost, but which continue to exist parallel to each other. [502] [184] Several examples could be cited of potential beginnings for such lines; thus one informant (T) was told by his older sisters of a line of "real blood relation" to his father, and he kept this line quite distinct among his relatives. He felt that this would be a definite bar to marriage with any of the people involved; yet his "great-granddaughter" through this line married his "great-grandson" through an older brother. Thus the younger children had forgotten, or ignored, this relationship entirely. The old man was quite obviously very disturbed when this relationship was pointed out to him; he himself had not thought of it specifically before.

The wide disparity between actual age and terminological generation between some of these systems of floating relationships suggests at least that they go back a good many generations. The most striking instance of this involved the other informant from whom a genealogy was collected (TY). She kept several lines distinct, all stemming from relationships which her maternal grandfather, a famous warrior (Red Young Man), had observed and she had 602 noticed, but which he had never explained. Two of these happened to converge 601 upon a friend of hers in the form of husbands, the first of whom my informant addressed as "younger brother," and the other as "great-grandfather."

[55] She also said that before acculturation into the white patterns, when the name-tabus were strong, parents would never tell children even in private more than one or two names of deceased people who were of importance in the family tree, and would do little more than indicate by what term one should call so-and-so, warning that it was a close relationship. It is easy to see how these children could grow up in ignorance of why they used certain terms, and not very aware of the closeness of the relationship, and thus pass on to their children little more than the usage of the terms.

Whether or not this is actually the origin of the majority of the relationships recognized is a matter for conjecture. In any case, we do find these very

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

many lines of relationship which each person traces, running back and forth through most of the people he knows, overlapping and coinciding very frequently. Naturally, the use of such a system involves many choices between two or more possible terms to be applied to some certain individual. The choices have often been made by one's parents, and are just adhered to; but in many other cases this is not so. It is especially true when one marries, for in this way a large constellation of new relationships is established through one's spouse. Usually, the choice is made, and this usage is continued thenceforward; if the connecting relationship is broken through death or divorce, the person may or may not keep the terminology established by it. Sometimes, the two alternatives are both kept alive, and are used interchangeably; operations of this sort make it easy to go one step further, and manipulate the terms of kinship in situations where there is no actual justification for some particular usage except expediency.

In most cases the choice is quite clear-cut: one relationship is closer than the other, and it is automatically used. Thus when T married his third wife, another woman whom he had called wife, or *hâipia*, and with whom he had been carrying on a joking relationship, became his sister. With the day of his marriage he began to call her "sister," and continued to do so, practically without exception, until his own wife died; the sister relationship was then abruptly dropped again. There are a great many such instances; this one is especially interesting because the reciprocal joking relationship, which had been avidly pursued, was terminated quite as abruptly as was the use of the term, and, with his wife's death, was at once reinstated; thus the relationship was conceived of both terminologically and behaviorally as existing quite apart from the person through whom it was made, and no restrictions of mourning were associated with it afterward.

By this same marriage, another woman who had been related as a sister through another "old relation" became a wife and *hâipia*, and started joking with her new-found "husband." They joked a good deal, but when she began to get the best of him, he would call her "sister," to remind her of the other relationship, and she would have to stop at once. A related situation is one in which, for example, a man's brother's wife, who had always called him "husband," and who was potentially his wife through the levirate, would start calling him by a sibling term upon the death of this brother, in order to indicate that it was not necessary for him to fulfill his obligation of replacing his brother as her husband. A fair number of such shifts were recorded, in various relationships where potential marriage situations existed. TY called her second husband's mother and her sister by the proper parent-in-law terms; but as they grew older they became blind, and she used to help them a great deal. To signalize this dependency they felt toward her, they began calling her "daughter," and she called them "mother." A daughter-in-law who gets along unusually well with her husband's mother is quite frequently called by the closer term of

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

602 daughter; in the same way, a girl who has been reared to a large extent by her
601 grandmother, especially if she is an orphan, or illegitimate, will be called "daughter," and will reciprocate by calling her grandmother "mother." It is interesting to note that these relationships, however artificial they may be, are always consistent. A person will never use a special relationship term toward another unless this other reciprocates by using an appropriate term toward the first.

The closer terms of kinship which we have just seen substituted for more distant correct terms are also extended in their application to non-related or little-known people toward whom one wishes to show friendliness or respect. Thus a man will usually call a stranger "father," or "mother's father," depending on his age—this latter term is considered to denote the closest relationship, as far as warmth and dependence go, of the two grandfathers.

More formalized are such usages as the reciprocal joking which goes on between grandparents and grandchildren, which operates largely by means of their using various sets of kinship terms and then making jokes about their consequences; this will be considered in more detail in the next section. Also, if
[572] two persons standing in a certain relationship to each other each have close friends of the same sex as themselves, these two friends may playfully adopt
[195] parallel relationship terms toward each other. The terms in this case have a phonetic pattern slightly different from the normal usage.

Perhaps of the same nature is the custom whereby two young men may call each other *nīmiīt'-i?*, "our girl friends," to signalize some affair which they had with two girls who were friends; this usage is said sometimes to continue throughout life, though no instances were recorded.

In these examples it is evident that the universal applicability of kinship terminology and the choices of relationships which are presented, together with extensions of its usage outside of genealogically traceable relatives, make this system a remarkably flexible tool in the hands of its users. With the selection of terms there is, apparently, a selection of behavior patterns also, always followed consistently by both parties involved.

The Comanche seem to follow the usual custom in regard to more distant relationships, wherein the behavior patterns found in the immediate family become gradually less distinct and demanding, and more permissive in nature, providing opportunities for fulfilling them to any degree which the person wishes. Yet some aspects of behavior appear to persist very strongly; this is well exemplified by the alternation of sister and joking relationships already mentioned.

It remains now to see what these behavior patterns are which are associated with the relationship terms, and to what extent there is a distinct pattern for each term.

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

BEHAVIOR PATTERNS[9]

In every situation, affectionate, formal, calm or excited, a kinship term is always the preferred form of address. There is no tabu on the use of the name for address, and it often has to be employed to distinguish individuals in a group, but this is not the kind nor respectful approach. Calling someone by his name when there is no real necessity for it is only to be done in anger, to show disdain, or perhaps with someone who is always irritable and no one cares for; thus TY called a "brother" she had acquired through her second marriage by name, because everyone always had—he was just an unpleasant man. It is doubtless this attribute of the terminology which makes it necessary, or at least strongly preferable, to have some relationship through which one may address any other Comanche one meets; the use of the terms to some extent provides the cues for the behavior of both persons, and tends to create a situation favorable to the speaker, especially in the use of relationships considered respectful. During peyote meetings, for example, the participants are always required to address each other by appropriate kinship terms.

As might be expected, these usages carry over into the folklore: coyote calls the other animals (unless they are bigger than he is) "little brother," as is so often the case, and the other animals similarly address each other by relationship terms. It is also significant that words for "sibling" or for "friend" are used to describe two animals, plants, etc., that are similar to each other.

For convenience in presentation, the material on behavior between relatives is grouped roughly by generation and by type of relationship, with distinctions made within these groups. The use of the present tense in these descriptions does not, of course, imply that these patterns still retain their full strength. Unless otherwise noted, all discussion is based on the culture at its pre-reservation peak.

Siblings. The relation between siblings of the same sex, and to a certain

[9] A large amount of the material used in this section was collected by Miss Kaarina Alho and Miss Nathalie F. Sampson from women informants; I wish to express to them my extreme gratitude for their kindness and generosity in thus making available for my use the results of several weeks of intensive work.

Due to the limited time at our disposal, and the fact that our emphasis was primarily on linguistics, the material here is perhaps rather scanty and occasionally inaccurate. However, it will suffice to provide a general outline of behavior in the most important relationship situations; I doubt that any important aspects have been completely omitted. It must not be overlooked that material obtained from the memory of participants in a broken culture tends to be slanted toward ideal types of behavior. While every attempt was made through searching questions and emphasis on actual cases to reduce this tendency, our data undoubtedly suffer from this bias.

A more rounded picture of Comanche culture as a whole has been presented by Kardiner (1945, pp. 51–80) using Linton's material. This may provide needed background in which to place these detailed patterns of behavior.

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

593 extent of opposite sex, is considered to be one of the closest. It is often said that his brothers are more dear to a man than his wife, and this is given as the reason why a man shares his wife with his younger brothers in a polyandrous [837] household. Men often leave their wives with their brothers when they go off on war-parties, and most people take it for granted that the brother will sleep with her during this time. Damage claims for wife stealing are practically never made upon brothers. It is a brother relationship to which the closest friends aspire, and they will often call each others' families by terms appropriate to this relation. Sisters, on the other hand, form the most desirable [595] combination of wives if a man is to have several, for they get along better together than any other women, and are less likely to be jealous.

[554] The oldest brother has much greater prestige than any of the others, unless he should be a complete coward and failure and have a spectacularly successful younger brother. His position is unique, for, unless he should die very young, his removal through death or moving away will not lead to the elevation of the next oldest brother to a position of special prestige. In this society of warriors, boys from puberty onward are always considered greatly superior to their sisters.

Relations between brothers and sisters are highly variable, and depend greatly upon the personalities of the individuals. The ideal picture is one of fondness and mutual help and kindness. Brothers bring their sisters horses when they return from raids, and will take their side and protect them in case of trouble; they frequently leave their wives with their sisters who will act as chaperones while they are away. A sister will care for her brother's horse when he comes in and perform many minor services for him; she may act as a messenger for an unmarried brother in arranging nocturnal trysts. But these and many other expressions of esteem and affection are only evident if they like each other.

[857] The other side of the picture reveals the fact that the oldest sibling present [576] is the boss of the others until they come of age. As the boys used to go out on war-parties as soon as they were old enough, this was usually an older sister. [195] She frequently whipped her brothers as a disciplinary measure, and often delighted in teasing them in various more or less nasty ways. The word *ɨ'rɨ?aiwapɨ*, "slave," could be applied by an older sibling to a younger, though this was considered being particularly unpleasant, and nice children did not do it! It is significant that while it was presumably permissible, this appellation [605] was rarely if ever used between siblings of the same sex. It is emphatically stated, incidentally, that this was never applied to cousins except as a joke.

593 Once a boy passed puberty, he usually went out on the warpath, and was therefore in imminent danger of being killed. For this reason, it is said, one 882 should let him have his way in all things. The boys do not seem to have been beyond capitalizing on this, and could and occasionally would whip their sisters even after they were married. It was the brother, more than anyone else, who

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

had the right to give his sister, often against her will, to any acquaintance who gave him presents of arrows or a horse or two. A male cousin also seems to have had this right in some cases.

After the age of ten or so, brothers and sisters were supposed to avoid each other's company to a certain extent, especially if they should be left alone, and could never undress in each other's company, even if they lived in the same tipi. At the age of fifteen, boys might have a separate hut of hide-covered branches or even their own tipi in which to sleep and entertain any lady-friends they might have.[10] Brothers and sisters should not joke with each other, nor mention anything to do with relations between the sexes.

Behavior between more distantly related siblings seems to depend on how well they know and like each other and, of course, on how much they see of one another. As noted before, however, the brother-sister restrictions seem to remain in force almost indefinitely.

Parent-Child. Parents do not seem to have been unusually fond of children, especially in the old days when they were a considerable nuisance to be transported about, and guarded from danger. Discipline was largely in the hands of older siblings, as noted above, when there were any. Instruction of the girls was often taken on by the maternal grandmother, who frequently lived with the family, and the maternal uncle and older brothers taught the boys. Their father was apt to be out on the warpath, especially when they were young, and their mother was busy with the housework—cooking, making clothes, and so on.

As the children grew up, there seems to have been a gradual change in the attitude of the parents toward them. Younger children in a family, or of several families living nearby, formed a somewhat undifferentiated group; they were not mistreated, nor even seriously neglected by their parents, but were only rarely singled out for personal attention. Then, when they achieved the age of ten or so, they began to emerge as definite personalities impinging on the adult world; the father would begin to coach his son in the art of war, and the girl's mother would initiate her daughter more seriously in the housework.

Each parent usually had a favorite among the children, frequently the oldest, though a woman might spoil her youngest daughter if she realized she was to be her last. This child would receive more attention, presents, etc., than the others, who were often quite jealous. However the hostility they could express was limited, because the parent would usually side with the favorite if any squabbles occurred. Somewhat distinct from this is the quite institutionalized favorite-child pattern, found commonly in Plains societies; the Comanche themselves seem to recognize the distinction. In wealthy families, small gifts given by poorer people to the favorite child carried with them an obliga-

[10] This was done primarily to avoid harming the boys' power through contamination from the family cooking and food. Linton, personal communication.

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

593
855 tion for the parents to make a munificent return gift, preferably with a horse, and for the child to give away the original gifts to less fortunate children. This child wore especially fine clothes, rarely had any work to do, was spoiled by everyone, could order his or her siblings and even parents around at will, was never forced into marriage, and was generally cock o' the walk. Such a child [595] was usually the offspring of the father's favorite wife (a wealthy man nearly always had several wives), so that jealousy usually was present among the other wives too, and they would neglect and annoy the favorite child whenever they thought they could get away with it. However, if the child were a boy, he would fairly soon start going off on war-parties, while a girl, not having her marriage arranged for the convenience of the parents, would probably marry [158] a man of some means and reputation, and move away also. It should be noted that favorite children never became *pa'ku'ci?*,[11] according to our informants.

Girls who were not favorites frequently had their marriages arranged for them by their fathers. While the girl was anxious to marry a glamorous warrior, the father preferred a poor but industrious man who would stay around the home and tend his stock for him, perhaps for two or three years or, with the inducement of additional daughters as rewards for good and continued service, [727] almost indefinitely. A captive (especially a Mexican) made the most dependent [554] ent, and hence reliable, son-in-law of all, though the lowered prestige of the resultant half-Comanche grandchildren was a deterrent to this practice.

597 Adoption of children was fairly common, especially for boys into families without any; in this case, they might become "favorite children." Proper [835] relationship terms for a son or daughter were applied; rigorous incest regulations did not hold with adopted children, but there was strong disapproval of marriage of adoptive siblings if they had been brought up together for a number of years. Close friends of sons might also be adopted when comparatively mature; marriage with them does not seem to have been so clearly outlawed though no cases are recorded. In connection with the early maturity and independence of boys, it is interesting to note that this type of adoption was considered to be solely a matter to be arranged between the boy and his prospective new family—his parents had no influence in the arrangements. There is some evidence that fairly immediate descendants of adopted children were, if possible, married to bona fide members of the family in order to get them more firmly grafted onto the family tree. While the fact that the child was not a blood relative was never forgotten, it appears that a person adopted into a family became practically as much a member of it as one born within it, and generally ceased using the old terms of relationship toward his original family,

[11] *pa'ku'ci?* were adults following institutionalized patterns of "silly" behavior. This behavior readily lends itself to at least superficial interpretation as an escape mechanism for maladjusted people. This term was also applied to "difficult" children, a separated usage, though of course related.

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

though this was not invariable. There was apparently no ceremony connected with adoption. 597

An illegitimate child was a great shame to all members of the family, and especially to the girl's brother, whose prestige was to some extent a reflection of that of his family. It was usually brought up by the girl's mother, whom it would call mother. Some pressure was put on the boy by the girl's parents to marry her, but he could not be forced to do so. The girl's family referred to him teknonymously, but his family apparently did not recognize the relationship at all. Her marriage possibilities were somewhat reduced by this unfortunate happening, and she might well become only a secondary wife of some older man. 848 [558] [551]

Twins were not wanted, and were generally considered a danger to the mother, as well as to all her blood kin to a lesser degree. This was especially true as they grew up, suggesting the effects of the gradual emergence of the child's personality discussed above. Some women, with the assistance of powerful names for the children, disregarded this belief and raised them together, but others disposed of the younger twin. If some woman did not come and offer to take one, it might be laid outside the tipi somewhere, where someone invariably came to get it. The mother attempted to forget it. If one twin died, all the clothing and other things which had been prepared for it were buried with it, and the mother or her sister made a round of the camp collecting what was offered in the way of other clothes. 845 [184] [847]

Among the parents' siblings, there is a definite emphasis on the mother's side. The mother's sisters were apt also to be married to one's father and, even if not, were usually around the family helping if possible. The mother's brother is also considered to be a source of guidance, assistance, and favors of fairly major proportions; it is significant that he, also, is permitted to give away a girl in marriage. As usual, behavior toward more distant parents, aunts and uncles depends on personality and propinquity; whether or not they have any children of their own is also often of importance. TY's father remained with her mother's family to marry two more sisters, so that she was brought up in the midst of a great number of maternal relatives. The members of this extended family were rather strikingly unprolific, so that she had very few even distant siblings; as a result she received a great deal of attention and an almost continuous stream of extremely valuable gifts from all her parents, aunts and uncles, even though related in very roundabout ways. Her younger brother, incidentally, became a favorite child according to the best institutionalized patterns. 604 593

Husband-Wife. Wives were very clearly dominated by their warrior-husbands, and acceded to their wishes in all matters, including the treatment of children. Men could, and often would, beat their wives on any pretext they chose, while a wife's infidelity frequently led to extremely harsh treatment, 593 684

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

593 684 including beating, gashing with a knife, and even cutting off her nose. However, in the first years of marriage, at least, a girl's parents, or her brother, could take her back and break up the marriage, especially if they had been instrumental in arranging it in the first place. This might lead to a damage suit by the deprived husband, particularly if she were to marry another man fairly soon; he would often collect from both father and brother, thereby asserting his rights over the woman even if he had not treated her properly.

593 586 Men were not expected to be as faithful as their wives and there was not much that the latter could do about it. However, it is interesting to observe that one of the reasons given for a man leaving his wife was in order to avoid a scene resulting from her jealousy. Other grounds for desertion were incompatibility, and the fact that a woman was a poor housekeeper, though this latter difficulty might be circumvented, if the woman was otherwise desirable, by taking on another, younger wife to do the work. It is significant, in connection with the comparative lack of regard for children mentioned above, that one informant questioned on the subject specifically denied that barrenness on the part of a wife was considered a valid excuse for leaving her. Marriage, on the whole, was a rather brittle relationship; divorces were strikingly frequent.

595 [482] [841] [684] If there were several wives, one was usually considered the favorite, though this was not necessarily the one the man had married first. She did much less work, bossed the household, and was much more intimate with her husband. When traveling, it was she who always carried her husband's shield, while the others tended the pack animals that carried the greasy meat which would have impaired the husband's power. If she were menstruating, incidentally, he carried the shield himself. While the favorite wife occupied an obviously superior position, and was much less liable to be punished for any misdemeanors, it was in keeping with her position as a more primarily sexual partner that adulterous lapses on her part were much more severely punished, even to the point of death.

Polygynous households usually occupied at least two tipis. The secondary wives lived in one main tipi; the favorite wife might also live here, and visit her husband more frequently in his private tipi, or she might actually live separately with him, though the dwellings were, or course, adjacent to each other. The children lived in the main tipi with the wives; the favorite wife usually was permitted to have her mother living here too, even if the whole family were not already living with her parents. This allowed the wife more free time to be a companion to her husband. If a secondary wife had a different mother she might occasionally also get her in, but two grandmothers seem to have been the limit. The tipi usually contained only three beds, one of which (to the North—the door was to the East) was for the man of the family, and another might have to be vacated in favor of a visitor at any time, so the women could not afford to gather in too large numbers.

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

men could not afford to gather in too large numbers. On other other hand, wealthier men often had a number of tipis, and their feminine entourage might thus have been of considerable size. 595 [556]

It is obvious that many opportunities were present for the growth of hostility between the wives, and fights appear to have been not uncommon.[12] The husband usually did not interfere, but left it to some of the wives' relatives or some other influential person. None but the favorite wife would come to the husband with grievances against another, as he was not likely to be very sympathetic.

Siblings-in-law. Of all the members of her husband's family a woman is likely to be most intimate with his sister. As we have seen before, he frequently left his wife with his sister when he went off on raiding parties; whether this was more common than leaving her with his brother is not clear, but one certainly gets such an impression. In this situation, the sister had pretty complete authority over the wife, at least as far as her relations with other men were concerned, but the usual pattern was of friendliness and mutual help, coupled with a certain amount of mild joking if they felt like it. 607

Brothers-in-law frequently felt a strong bond, and were likely to seek each other's company and aid in preference to any but their own brothers. This is doubtless closely connected with the recognized custom of men giving their sisters to their friends as wives. Brothers-in-law are expected to joke a great deal together, the jokes being insulting, personal, and often coarse. The words for spider, *taitʔɛɪ*, and for tarantula, *pi'hireʔɛɪ*, are recognized to mean "someone's brother-in-law" and "hairy brother-in-law" respectively, while common pharses substituted for this relationship term are given as "our testicles" and "our smell of dog urine." Examples of this sort could be multiplied indefinitely. [195] [522]

The dominant pattern of behavior between siblings-in-law of opposite sex is the reciprocal joking relationship so commonly found among Plains tribes. It apparently does not exist among the Shoshoni in just this form, and the existence of the two terms for denoting this relationship among the Comanche suggests the intrusion of the custom along with the term, though I have been unable to locate a similar word in another tribe. Repeated questions failed to elicit any preference for the *hâipia* (sibling-in-law of opposite sex) or the spouse term in any given situation, joking or otherwise; they seem to be interchangeable. The genealogies reveal that different individuals with whom the informants joked and generally carried on similar relationships were sometimes called by one, sometimes by the other, and often by both terms. However, although the spouse terms are often used in joking too, there is no doubt that the joking *relationship* was on the basis of their being each other's *hâipia*. Thus there was some feeling that it was not quite right for husband and wife,

[12] Catlin (1845, Vol. 2, pp. 64–5) found such fights to be among the most striking features of Comanche community life.

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

607 who do not use this term, to joke in quite the same way, while TY, whose first husband's older brother was "mean," never joked with him and therefore never called him anything but "husband."

Women are usually the initiators of the joking, whether it is physical or verbal. It is not obligatory, however, and if the man consistently becomes annoyed, it is the woman who is considered in the wrong; the characteristic behavior is thus associated only permissively with the relationship. A man may also warn her that she has gone far enough, and she will cease; she is in a rather vulnerable position, as the man may know of some infidelity of hers, and if he should start making a public joke of this, she might get into serious trouble with her husband or brother. A woman is usually counseled by a sister or woman friend against carrying a joke too far, if it is thought that trouble is brewing. It is said that *hâipia's* could take a lot of "ribbing" in the old days, [177] but that now they become annoyed very easily; there is no doubt that the [522] influence of the white man has greatly curtailed the pursuit and enjoyment of "off-color" humor which so characterized some phases of Comanche life. This is especially true of the joking which involved physical contact—pinching, making mock love, and so on—in public.

607 Verbal joking between *hâipia's* most commonly deals with another person 522 with whom the victim is suspected of intriguing; these jokes are not made flagrantly public, but a woman may, for example, use some physical peculiarity of her *hâipia's* suspected mistress as the basis of a special name which she calls him in public, meanwhile taunting him continually in private. He becomes embarrassed and his wife suspicious—she may try to find out to whom this name refers. Practical jokes, or jokes about the victim's physical appearance, do not seem to be usual.

While jokes of this sort may be made between any unrelated man and woman (though the term *hâipia* is never used in this context), the actual relationship provides for the most important outlet for sexual joking between the sexes; the spouse may not like it, but when it is institutionalized, he or she can make little objection. That there is a connection between this joking and the fact that the *hâipia* is one's potential spouse through the levirate or sororate is undeniable; one informant even stated that these relatives went so far as to have actual sexual relations in the old days, and it seems reasonable that this should have been the case.

More distantly or doubtfully related siblings-in-law may act in accordance with the expected patterns or not, according to the individuals' preferences; a couple of examples of the *hâipia* relationship were mentioned before. This joking pattern of behavior may often be followed with striking gusto to the most distant of relatives.

607 The use of the term *nīmī'ᵊâra'*, "our (children's) uncle," as a substitute 195 for *tê'ci*, "man's brother-in-law," or *pâhapia'pī'*, "woman's sister-in-law," is not

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

very clear. It is apparently a "slang" word which has come into more and more common usage in late years. Most of the old people object to its wide use, and there are few young people who do not recognize that the other forms are more proper, even if they seldom use them. In the old days it was often customary for a young man (especially if a captive) who wished to marry a girl and who approached her brother with gifts, to call him *nimi?ara?*, and thus formally admit his desire for the man's sister. As a brave warrior presumably would not have to resort to this somewhat demeaning method of getting a wife, the use of the term is looked upon as being particularly unfortunate by some of the older people. Related to this marriage custom is the use of the term by two friends who cooperated in obtaining women for each other for non-marital purposes. These "sweetheart"-liaisons were apt to last for some time, and the women involved often called each other *nimi?ara?* also, as well as the more correct sister terms. This seems to be the only possible basis for women's present use of the word, but it is rather tenuous, and certainly "incorrect," even here. While in the marriage situation above the use of the term might be continued for some time between the men concerned, if one of them attained any marked prestige, it was always dropped in favor of the proper usage. The use of the term was somewhat correlated with band membership.

Parents-in-law. There is no mother-in-law tabu among the Comanche, though the general patterns of respect due the parents' generation, and a certain amount of avoidance of overly sexual topics of conversation are proper in dealing with the parents-in-law.

There is such very wide variation in relations with parents-in-law, depending on personality, residence and by whom the marriage was arranged that it is difficult to formulate any all-inclusive statements on the subject. Thus we have cases in which the boy's mother bluntly tells his new wife that they don't like her and don't want her, while others say that a girl's relations with her mother-in-law are among the closest of any, as was the case in TY's first marriage.

In the fairly frequent case of the girl's marriage being arranged by her family, the son-in-law moves in to live with or near them, and relations are generally pretty close, at least superficially. Not only have personality factors already been considered, but it is in the interest of the parents to keep their daughter's husband satisfied, and hence working for them, while he is aware that they can break up the marriage if his behavior is unsatisfactory. Also, he usually hopes to get a second daughter as a wife if he pleases his in-laws. Thus, if there is an argument, they will usually intercede on the boy's side if this is reasonable in the situation. While living together, the boy tends his father-in-law's stock and receives some in return; in the old days, he used also to herd the horses and bring his mother-in-law meat and hides, while she made him especially nice clothes. After two or three years, the husband often had accumulated enough property, either as gifts from his in-laws or through his own

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

606 efforts at raiding and such, to move away and set up for himself. In this case his wife's mother, if she were widowed, often came along to live with them; sometimes both the wife's parents lived in a tipi nearby.

Relations with parents-in-law are very incompletely defined in the many other less formal marriage set-ups, and it is not profitable to attempt to generalize upon them, except perhaps to say that a modified form of the above was usually the desideratum. There is no feeling that the parents of the two spouses should be especially friendly to each other or the reverse; this also depends primarily on the circumstances. As noted above, the terminology does not recognize any relationship between them.

603 [591] [576] *Grandparents.* A parent-in-law is a very short way from being a grandparent, and many of the factors operative in one relationship affect the other. Thus the comparatively frequent matrilocal residence is reflected in the fact that it is the maternal grandparents who are considered the closest; we have seen above that a person wishing to be respectful to a stranger always addresses him as a maternal grandfather. This term is also applied to treasured inanimate objects, and even to parts of the body. It is thus not surprising that children are said to learn the words for maternal grandparents before those for the paternal ones.

Often the grandmothers' most important function is caring for their children's smaller children (see p. 86). Thus TY received a great deal of attention and instruction from both her grandmothers, and especially from her mother's mother, until they died, and even felt them to be more of a factor in her life at this time than her own mother. When a married daughter moved away after a few years of amicable matrilocal residence, her mother sometimes kept one of the children of whom she was especially fond to bring up herself; this child then usually called her mother.

Joking with grandparents is usually confined to the maternal ones, and is not carried on after the children reach maturity. As mentioned in the preceding section, some inappropriate relationship is pretended, and jokes are made in terms of the behavior expected of such a relationship. The children may call them by parent-in-law terms; the girls are then berated about being seen with various boys, usually ones they particularly dislike, the boys are told to do odd jobs for their "in-laws," and so on. Or they may reciprocally use various combinations of sibling and sibling-in-law terms, leading to *hâipia* jokes, though apparently without the physical aspects. The grandchildren may even put the grandparents into the children's generation, with appropriate comments, or reverse such affectionate terms as "my dear little ones" which the grandparents usually apply to them. A widowed grandmother may also be teased about various older men in the community, though usually not if she actually has a particular liking for any of them.

Relations with great-grandparents are slight, since, when this relationship

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

does exist, senility or infancy almost always makes one or both participants comparatively ineffective. 603

The same factors which affect one's attitude toward more distant parents are also operative in the case of grandparents, with the effect of comparative age more strongly operative.

"Friends." While there is considerable variation in how clearly it is recognized and expressed by different individuals, there is no doubt that the Comanche share with other Plains tribes the custom of an institutionalized friendship between men of the same age. This usually had its origin in warfare, when one man or boy would save another's life by a deed of conspicuous bravery; or perhaps they would just go out together several times, and this friendship would grow to the point where it was openly recognized. Such friends became constant companions, sharing everything with each other, including their women friends; thus it is still customary for friends to refer to their respective partners as "our wife" or "our sweetheart," and other people use the dual form of the possessive in referring to a man's friend's wife as "your wife." A man uses terms for his friend's family which would equate the friend with a brother and this relationship was not infrequently realized in the old days through adoption. However, this rather romantic picture is somewhat spoiled by a revelation which profoundly shocked one of our rather idealistic interpreters, to the effect that this supposedly lifelong bond not infrequently became somewhat weakened, and a new "friend" came to fill the place of the old.[13] 572 [597] 572 183

Although warfare has become a thing of the past for the Indians (except for the battlefields of Europe and the Pacific), a few of the more romantic or lonesome individuals have attempted to continue this custom, but it has generally lapsed. One of our informants, (I), who came to his maturity shortly after the Comanche were rounded up at Fort Sill, embraced it quite vigorously, including the *nīmī?ɾa?* relationship, but discovered after a time that his "friend" believed only in one-way sharing, and was forced to give it up.

Outside of this formalized situation, the use of the term *hâic*, "friend," is not at all clear. Two major focal relationships are covered by it: the institutionalized friend, and one's brothers (though usually not one's own brothers). Both of these are spread out, often with very attentuated behavorial associations, to include a great number of people—in fact, virtually all males of one's own age or generation. These two groups of people merge and are, in fact, never really separate, for even in the friendship discussed above, they are combined insofar as possible. Yet in many cases a person is recognized as one or the other; individuals differ in this regard. T, for instance, referred to a man as 572 196

[13] A derived, but very distinct, practice was for a man of low prestige to enter into a *hâic* relationship with a successful warrior. The subordinate partner acted essentially as a body-servant for his dominant "friend," especially on war-parties or while hunting, and in turn basked in the reflected glory and protection of a strong man. Linton, personal communication.

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

572 196 *hâic* only if he wished to emphasize that for one reason or another he did not consider him a relative at all, and TY used *ii'·i?* in much the same way. All informants agreed that sibling terms provided a much closer and warmer way of expressing the relationship, but used the friend designation in casual conversation as being more informal. No attempt is made to distinguish which variety of "friend" the individual is; this is assumed to be known to anyone who might be present. It is possible that some of the confusion in this regard is a product of contact with white people, many of whom have *hâic* as practically the only Comanche word in their vocabularies, and use it as a greeting without discrimination; but this does not seem to be the most important factor, for there is every indication that this lack of clear definition of the application of the term is aboriginal. However, the use of *hâic* as an equivalent of "sweetheart" does seem to have been a translation of the American "girl friend," "boy friend."

This lack of clarity makes it practically impossible to formulate any even approximate behavior pattern associated with this term if, indeed, any exists; such opinions as were offered in answer to general questions were obviously references to one or both of the focal relationships, in spite of the fact that the term is seldom applied to own brothers, and the formal friendship, when it did exist, was far from including all the individuals who were regularly called *hâic*. An analogous situation is apparent in our own culture where "friendship," is conceived of as a warm and unselfish relationship, expressive of all our more worthwhile values, and yet one considers hundreds of people "friends" toward whom one is willing to display little more of this ideal behavior than a cheery "hello."

The feminine counterpart of *hâic*, *ii'·i?*, operates in about the same way, and its usage is often no clearer. Whether the institutionalized friendship ever existed here, and if so, what its basis was, is not apparent. Inasmuch as the affairs of women between themselves were generally considered to be pretty trivial by the dominant warriors of days gone by, it is almost certain that no friendship among them could have achieved the public recognition which the *hâic* relationship did. It is not clear whether women recognized the especially close friendships which obviously existed among them as being a comparable phenomenon, though they presumably did.

602 *Discussion.* It is obvious from the foregoing brief discussion of behavior that there is a definite and distinctive pattern associated with each relationship situation, and that each relative has a number of more or less clear-cut functions toward the individual. While these patterns are unquestionably identified to some extent by the use of kinship terms, it cannot be said on the basis of this alone that the terms are themselves the primary factors in determining behavior; a close group of relatives might well function in much the same way even if their relationships were not terminologically conceptualized.

But the real test can be applied when the terms are used outside of the

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

602

fairly immediate family to identify more distant relatives, or in unusual situations. Such data as have been presented with each discussion of relationship above are not entirely conclusive. The gradual diminution of behavioral association with terms applied to progressively more distant relatives is far from denying to these terms any behavioral content, for it would hardly be expected that all people called, for example, "brother," would be treated equally intimately; but it is important to note that these patterns become increasingly optional and that they are followed only if it is agreeable or convenient to do so. Among other things, without going directly counter to an established usage, two individuals who do not wish to follow its consequences may often find another suitable relationship to recognize, or even invent one.

Stronger evidence, perhaps, for the association of behavior with the mere words which identify relationships can be found in the various manipulations of terms and in the complications involved in changes of relationship described in the preceding section on application of the terminology.[14] The situations in these cases arise solely on account of such associations, which are sometimes very specific, and at others very general. Although we must here recognize that only a very small or diffuse segment of behavior is involved, and that the patterns are far from playing the dominant role in an individual's life which those of closer relationship do, nevertheless it is clearly the kinship term alone which evokes and signalizes the complicating attitudes and relationships.

An interesting reversal occurred in T's life. His father lived a very long time and had many wives and children. When he was quite old his last wife had, as her only child, my informant (whose legitimacy I could naturally never question). As a result, his half-siblings were far older than he; and the early death of his mother left him dependent upon them for such family life as he had. While he was still very young, his older brothers all died from sickness or in battle, and one of his closest male relatives, who took him into his family for some time, was the son of one of these brothers, and was thus also terminologically T's son. It was stated that this man was old enough to be his father; whether or not this rather remarkable fact was true, he was old enough to act *in loco parentis* to my informant, and did. Insistent questioning did not reveal any behavior which could have been associated with T's terminological position as father. A similar reversal, which involved the son of one of his sisters, was made simpler by the use of a reciprocal "uncle" term; I was not able to discover whether he even considered this an inversion at all. These cases clearly show that where a conflict arises between the behavior normally associated with a term and the behavior expected within the family group, the latter is completely dominant.

In sum, then, we see that there is a certain, often minimal, amount of

[14] Hoebel (1940), p. 57, provides a similar example in which a man disrupts another's levirate claims by reminding the claimant that he is his son-in-law through a classificatory brother, and hence should be careful lest he lose his wives.

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

602 behavior and of course affect which is associated with the calling of any individual by a relationship term, and which arises directly from the use of the term, even where the behavior pattern has no functional validation. In some very unusual cases this association may be completely eliminated by some conflicting factor, but more frequently the conflict is resolved by the substitution of some other term whose behavioral concomitants are more suitable. The opportunity for such manipulation of the terminology is dependent to some degree upon how distantly related in the classificatory category the individual in question is from the person who stands in the focal relationship to the speaker. To be effective, these substituted terms must be used reciprocally and consistently by all parties involved. The use of kinship terms for the Comanche is never a one-way affair; the relationship which the application of a term signalizes always demands that the person addressed reciprocate with the appropriate complementary term, and generally also with the behavior thus implied. Otherwise the initial usage is meaningless.

YALE UNIVERSITY
NEW HAVEN, CONN.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

113 CATLIN, GEORGE
1945 *Illustrations of the Manners, Customs, and Condition of the North American Indians.* 5th Edition, 2 Vols. London.

EGGAN, FRED (Ed.)
1937 *Social Anthropology of North American Tribes.* Chicago.

HOEBEL, E. A.
1939 Comanche and Hjkandika Shoshone Relationship Systems. *American Anthropologist,* n.s., 41: 440–457.
1940 *The Political Organization and Law-ways of the Comanche Indians.* Memoir 54, American Anthropological Association.

KARDINER, A.
1945 *The Psychological Frontiers of Society.* New York.

KROEBER, A. L.
1934 Yurok and Neighboring Kin Term Systems. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology,* 35: 15–22.

RADCLIFFE-BROWN, A. R.
1930 The Social Organization of Australian Tribes. *Oceania,* 1: 34–63.
1935 Kinship Terminologies in California. *American Anthropologist,* n. s., 37: 530–535.

STEWARD, J. H.
1938 Review of *The Social Anthropology of North American Tribes* (Fred. Eggan, Ed.). *American Anthropologist,* n.s., 40: 720–722.

[pp 95- end not processed]